

**Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary
Marine Reserves Working Group Meeting**

December 14, 2000
8:30 A.M. — 4:30 P.M.
Chase Palm Park Center
236 East Cabrillo Boulevard
Santa Barbara, California

MEETING SUMMARY

Meeting Objectives

The objectives of this meeting were:

- Seek closure on remaining goals and objectives
- Develop questions for the Science and Socio-economic Panels

In Attendance:

Patty Wolf, Co-Chair, served as
facilitator for the day
Dave Parker, alternate for Patty Wolf
Sean Hastings alternate for Matt Pickett,
Co-Chair
Locky Brown
Marla Daily
Gary Davis
Robert Fletcher
Dr. Craig Fusaro
Dale Glantz

Neil Guglielmo
Mark Helvey
Deborah McArdle
Dr. Michael McGinnis
Chris Miller
Tom Raftican
Steve Roberson
Alicia Stratton
Greg Helms

DFG Staff — John Ugoretz
Public included approx. 25 people

1. Welcome and Introductions (Round Table)

Patty Wolf, Co-Chair and acting facilitator for the meeting, welcomed everyone, introductions were made around the table. The public introduced themselves too.

2. Overview of Meeting Agenda (Patty Wolf)

Several MRWG members participated in a planning call to assist in drafting the agenda and preparing for the meeting. The MRWG was encouraged to proceed through early administrative items quickly. The bulk of the day was structured to focus on addressing and adopting remaining goals and objectives. Additionally, time was permitted to develop a series of questions for both the science and socioeconomic panels.

3. Review/Adopt Meeting Summaries (Sept, Oct., Nov., Public Forum 2000)

There were four outstanding meeting summaries that dated back to September 2000. CINMS staff suggested a process to expedite the review and approval of the meeting summaries by sending written comments to Sanctuary staff no later than

12/22/00. The meeting summaries would then be considered adopted and posted to the Sanctuary's web site. Time was permitted for anyone who had a substantial problem to address it in this meeting.

4. MRWG members provided a summary of their constituent outreach efforts and feedback they have received.

Alicia Stratton — Presented preliminary maps at a Ventura Surfrider Chapter meeting. She invited comments, but has not received any yet (the meeting was held just a couple days ago). Alicia impressed on the Surfrider chapter that these were preliminary maps. There is a great interest in future public meetings.

Mark Helvey — Nothing to report.

Dale Glantz — Nothing to report.

Gary Davis — The Channel Islands National Park Service will provide \$45,000 to support the process and is working quickly to transfer the funding to the US Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution (Institute). This funding will continue the facilitation contract with John Jostes, and the services of Michael Eng.

Patty Wolf — Mike Eng has proposed a facilitator budget, and with the welcomed National Park money it JUST covers the process through May 2001. Additional funding will likely be needed for the process and MRWG members should consider possible funding sources.

Sean Hastings — Mike Eng and the Institute have provided a comprehensive overview of the facilitation process to date, and what will be needed to finish the process. If MRWG members are interested in the overview and proposal it can be made available. Most MRWG members were interested and requested copies of the proposal.

Mike McGinnis — Has sent via email an essay to the MRWG and to about 200 people. On Wednesday he met with Chris Miller and discussed socioeconomic issues to try an iron out differences and possible conflicts before the MRWG meeting.

Bob Fletcher — People who fish Santa Barbara Island (SBI) have gotten into the process very late. The Pacific Fisheries Management Council and CA Fish and Game Commission (FGC) have recently closed the deeper water around SBI, fishermen are now worried about access to Western SBI - species of concern include yellow tail and to a lesser degree kelp bass, not necessarily rockfish. Bob has spoke with people around Pt. Hueneme and they re very worried about the reserves process. If these people survive the other regulatory actions currently underway, they may not survive additional changes, like reserves. He received a phone call from Sal Gonzalez from the McNeal Leher News Hour, who is interested in preparing a news story on this process. Mr. Gonzales is attempting to pull together a balanced view, where each interest is treated equally.

Patty Wolf— Has also received calls from Mr. Gonzales but hasn't spoken directly with him. The FGC recently adopted regulations that address recreational fishing for shelf groundfish and the nearshore fishery. The topic is complicated, and will only be briefly reviewed today.

Shelf regulations were adopted as presented by the Department of Fish and Game. Nearshore regulations were adopted too. The exact size and location of the Cowcod closure is now available. In a nutshell the Federal Regulations are designed to address overfished species with rebuilding plans and limited catch. Rockfish and Lingcod closures may be expanded in due time. Northern CA to Cape Mendocino is closed March — June but allows nearshore fishing within 20 fathoms. Point Conception and South to the Mexican border is closed November — February. Bag limits are reduced for bocaccio and canary rockfish. Cowcod take is prohibited. A minimum cabezon size limit has been set. There is purposeful overlap between the Pacific Fisheries Management Council and State regulations. Inside 20 fathoms within the Cowcod closed area is completely closed to shelf species, and open only for nearshore species.

Nearshore regulations cover species not on the shelf, including cabezon, shrimp, rock and kelp greenling, and are designed to reduce catch by 50% from recent years. Size limits, closed areas, closed times all are part of the package. Groundfish regulations are incorporated. Commercial fishing for Cabezon and kelp and rock greenling is closed statewide on Thursday through Sunday. Transport is allowed under permit. Commercial Passenger Fishing Vessels are required to carry and cooperate with observers. Some species added to nearshore list (about seven), and nearshore is now both recreational and commercial take. The definition of nearshore waters is out to a depth of 20 fathoms rather than 1 nm from shore. The new regulations have eliminated transportation receipts.

Greg Helms— Is distance to shore not used for nearshore?

Patty Wolf — It is 20 fathoms or 1 nm whichever is greater.

Bob Fletcher — The nearshore and groundfish regulatory processes are fraught with controversy. Some commercial representatives have said they will go back to the legislature to remove power from the Fish and Game Commission. The Cowcod closure is a 4200 sq. miles marine reserve. The end of new regulations are not in sight, these are only interim regulations. A nearshore Fishery Management Plan team, with an advisory group, has been developed. This is the first salvo in an ongoing difficult series of actions. The area under consideration is very close to the area the MRWG is considering.

Patty Wolf — allocation between commercial and recreational take is crucial. The FGC decided to allocate based on historic catch. In the 80 s it was mainly recreational. The FGC considered the entire period. There is a lot of controversy about that.

Craig Fusaro— What data was used?

Patty Wolf— Pacfin, Recfin, and MRFSS and DFG data. Federal Groundfish species are the ones in the cowcod area. It does exclude prawn trawls.

Was CA Halibut added to the nearshore list?

NO

Greg Helms — Also spoke with Mr. Gonzalez, sometime after the holidays. A stringer or media researcher, for several LA stations has been calling too. Local media people are staying informed, not necessarily for a specific story. In the last couple months the local

CMC office has seen an increase in calls. Greg spoke with staff and users in Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary, many users have come a long way from their original sentiments of say no to NOAA. Many local calls have been generated from the recent newspaper articles, people are trying to understand the current regulations, and this includes the dive community. The reserve maps generated to date have left some people asking what's up with the East End? why are no reserves proposed in that region? People also want to know if interim regulations are valid or need changes.

Tom Raftican — Had two guests on his television show, Patty and Matt, which generated a lot of information. Asked the MRWG does anyone understand the new regulations? A lot of things are coming down, because of that confusion it is difficult to decide what is really needed in terms of reserves. The Breaux bill — states that if recreational fishing does not hurt an area it should be allowed. Nearly three-quarters of the testimony at the FGC were recreational anglers and divers. Buffer zones around no-take zones that allow recreational fishing only are a popular concept.

Locky Brown — Has provided information to divers and dive council newsletters. The draw your own reserve map has resulted in one response. CMC seems to be getting more divers input than the diving councils.

Neil Guglielmo — Squid fishermen are out working. There is some concern over the Gaviota National Seashore movement and other possible regulations. He is looking forward to the socioeconomic reports in January.

Sean Hastings — Noted that a SB Independent media reporter is present. Sam, the stringer referred to by Greg Helms, also contacted the Sanctuary. Sean was on FishTalk radio Saturday morning with Tom Raftican. He also participated in a Ventura Port District meeting, which resulted in two newspaper articles, mainly about the Sanctuary Management Plan. The Ventura Port is very concerned about potential socioeconomic impacts. There were several reserve related public comments the last SAC meeting, and a request came to host meetings in the evening so more of the public could attend. Mike Murray, SAC coordinator, has synthesized the public comments from the SAC meeting and they are in the public comment notebook brought to every MRWG meeting. Matt Pickett has been in Washington DC dealing with the development and eventual release of the Sanctuary's Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Management Plan.

Craig Fusaro — There were 18 people who provided public comments at the SAC meeting. Port representatives provided interesting new information. Craig met with Pete Wiley from NOAA, Greg Helms, and Chris Miller to discuss socioeconomic goals and objectives. They reached a lot of understanding and agreement on goals.

Steve Roberson — Met with Milton Love and viewed the Osborn bank videos. He saw very few fish and lots of trawl gear on the bank. He found the videos a bit depressing because where you would normally expect lots of fish, the fish were not there. The high spot is about 200-300 feet deep.

Chris Miller — Attended Monterey meeting of west coast Harbor Masters. Representatives from port authorities from Santa Barbara to HMB, as well as fishing organizations were present. He spoke at the meeting on the marine reserve process and

sanctuary expansion, specifically about the need for balance between goals for protecting areas as well as the fishing communities and social entities. The PCFFA president was there. There will be a similar meeting next month with southern ports represented (Ventura, San Pedro). Chris was able to explain the socioeconomic study and how it could apply to other fleets to assist in developing information on their fisheries. He also contacted the Pt. Conception Groundfishermen Association who fish San Miguel Islands foul area, and put them in touch with Bob Leaworthy to get their information in to the socio-economic study. This might help prevent them from causing problems later in the process.

Bruce Steel. — Sitting in for Marla today. He attended a Ventura County port district task force meeting, which is part of a bigger group of working ports and harbors group. That group is opposed to expansion and closed areas and are planning a lobbying trip to Washington DC. Bruce explained how difficult it is to separate the two processes.

5. Goals, Objectives and Recommendations - refinement and adoption

The MRWG addressed the remaining unresolved goals and objectives for Socio-economics and Sustainable Fisheries. The November 2000 version of the Socio-economic goal was used as the starting point for the discussion. The starting point for the Sustainable Fisheries goal was the Sustainable Harvested Populations goal formerly agreed to by consensus at the June 2000 MRWG meeting. Patty Wolf facilitated a lively and robust discussion that led to eventual consensus on both goals and objectives. John Ugoretz edited the goals and objectives using a lap top computer connected to a LCD that projected the language on the wall. This format allowed the MRWG to view language changes and test different approaches in a format that was easy to read and easy to edit on the spot.

The goals and objectives for Research and any other objectives related to monitoring, evaluation and assessment were relocated and incorporated under the Recommendation section. This new section is titled Monitoring, Evaluation and Assessment Recommendations. The entire Recommendation section is in draft form and requires review and adoption by the MRWG.

The final versions of the Socio-economic and Sustainable Fisheries goals are as follows:

SOCIOECONOMICS

Goal:

To maintain long-term socioeconomic viability while minimizing short-term socioeconomic losses to *all* users and dependent parties.

Objectives:

1. To provide long-term benefits for all users and dependent parties.
2. To minimize and equitably share short term loss in activity for all users and dependent parties.

3. To maintain the social and economic diversity of marine resource harvest by equitably sharing the loss of access to harvest grounds among all parties to the extent practical when designing reserves.
4. To address unavoidable socioeconomic losses created by reserve placement through social programs and management policy.

SUSTAINABLE FISHERIES

Goal:

To achieve sustainable fisheries by integrating marine reserves into fisheries management.

Objectives:

1. To increase abundance, distribution, reproductive capacity and individual sizes of harvested populations in marine reserves in the Channel Islands region.
2. To facilitate rebuilding and sustaining harvested populations.
3. To enhance spillover into non-reserve areas.
4. To establish a recognition program for sustainable fisheries in the Channel Islands region.

Due to time constraints the MRWG agreed to resume their review and editing of the Recommendations section during the January 2001 meeting. John Ugoretz and Sean Hastings will distribute the Recommendation section to the MRWG for their review prior to the meeting.

6. Development of questions for the Science and Socio-economic Panels

The MRWG developed a list of questions to forward to the Science and Socio-economic Panels, and requested that the Panels provide answers during the joint MRWG/Science and Socio-economic Panels meeting in January.

Questions for the Science Panel

1. Part of the Science Panel recommendation included a 30% to 50% reduction of harvest effort — The MRWG would like to know from what level? (current fishing effort? Take into account there is different effort for different fisheries. Note that some fisheries have a limited entry program already) Also, reduction in effort from which area? (i.e. Sanctuary waters only or broader range, such as Southern Calif. Bight?)
2. As reserve size is decreased, which objectives are not met? In what order do they fall away? How does the probability of success decrease?

3. Can other current management measure (i.e. the Cowcod closure that includes Santa Barbara Island) reduce the recommended reserve size?
4. How specific can the Science Panel be about what is lost (what is not achieved) at less than a 30% reserve?
5. What species, if any, are unique to the Channel Islands? Where are they located?
6. What is the catastrophic insurance multiplier (e.g. 1.5) and how does it affect the recommendation?
7. What are the criteria for risk of extinction at the Channel Islands? How does extinction factor into the recommendation?
8. What assumptions does the Science Panel have and how do they effect the recommendation?
9. a. What guidance or direction did the Science Panel use to craft its recommendation?
b. Beyond the ecosystem biodiversity and sustainable fisheries goals and objectives, what was the basis of your recommendations?
10. Explain how the ecosystem biodiversity and sustainable fisheries goals are compatible?
11. Review the step from single species models to ecosystem model.
12. Please rank how large the reserves have to be.
13. Can the panel estimate reserve size for specific species of concern? If not, how can the MRWG socio-economic objective: To equitably share loss among all users — be achieved? There was concern regarding the necessary size of reserves for certain species.
14. Can you identify sources of high rockfish production at the islands?
(There was a comment that Milton Love may be able to help address this question).
15. How will reserves affect kelp abundance?
16. Is a 20% reserve set aside + a 10% reduction in harvest effort comparable to a 30% reserve?
17. What if there are changes in the boundary. Are they assuming that fishing outside does not change?
18. If effort is not reduced outside the reserve, what happens and does this effect the science panel recommendation?

Questions for the Socioeconomic Panel

1. If the socioeconomic panel has not collected data on secondary industries or sectors, how do they estimate impacts to those sectors?
2. What will the impact analysis tell us and not tell us?
3. How much of a hit can each of the user groups sustain before they are forced out of the Channel Islands area? Is it anticipated that they
4. What is the resolution for comparing reserve scenarios? How big a change must we make to see a change in socioeconomic impacts?
5. Can the Socioeconomic panel forecast benefits of reserves?

7. Agenda Items suggested for the January 2001 meeting

Recap of Science Panel recommendation, and responses to MRWG questions.

Recap of Socio-economic data and impact analysis and responses to MRWG questions.

Time needed to addressing the list of unresolved issues developed during the November 2000 meeting.

4:30 pm The Meeting Adjourned